

SP-L3 Comprehensive Plan Consistency*December 11, 2001***1.0 Introduction/Background**

Many management and planning entities develop comprehensive management plans to help them manage the resources they are responsible for. These comprehensive plans may be consistent with, or inconsistent with, other comprehensive management plans. When they are not consistent, management direction of one entity may result in damage to the resources management by another entity.

To help reduce potential resource and management conflicts, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) requires that relicensing applicants evaluate how compatible their project and project operations are with other comprehensive management plans.

2.0 Study Objectives

The objectives of this study are to determine the compatibility and consistency of project operations with comprehensive and/or management plans and policies that have been developed by planning and resource agencies and other entities.

3.0 Relationship to Relicensing/Need for the Study

FERC requires projects to be consistent with the comprehensive and/or management plans that they receive. Such plans may include federal, state, regional and local plans. It is important to know if current and potential project-related policy, management, and operational activities are consistent with appropriate comprehensive/management plans.

No Issue Statements or Issues that address consistency with comprehensive and/or management plans have been developed by the Land Use Work Group.

4.0 Study Area

The Study Area includes Lake Oroville, the lands and waters within and adjacent to (1/4 mile) the FERC project boundary, and adjacent lands, facilities and areas with a clear project nexus.

5.0 General Approach

Task 1—Review and Summary of Existing Comprehensive Plans

This task will involve a literature and data review of existing FERC-identified comprehensive/management plans. Plans that are not on the FERC approved list (such as the general and transportation plans of Butte County and the City of Oroville), but that may influence land use and management of Study Area lands, will also be reviewed. The plans and/or portions of the plans that are relevant to the Study Area will be summarized as part of Task 1.

The plans that will be reviewed include, but are not limited to:

FERC-Identified Plans

- California Outdoor Recreation Plan. California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). 1993. Sacramento, CA. April 1994.
- Public Opinions and Attitudes on Outdoor Recreation in California—1997. DPR. 1993. Sacramento, CA. March 1988.
- The California Water Plan Update. California Department of Water Resources (DWR). *Bulletin 160-93*. Sacramento, CA. October 1994.
- Recreation Needs in California. DPR. 1983. Sacramento, CA. March 1983.

Plans Not Identified by FERC

- Butte County General Plan. Butte County. Oroville, CA. 1996.
- City of Oroville General Plan. Oroville, CA. 1995.
- Plumas National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (LMRP). United States Forest Service (USFS). Quincy, CA. 1988.
- Redding Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision. Bureau of Land Management (BLM). Redding, CA. 1993.
- Recreation Plan for Lake Oroville State Recreation Area. DWR. Sacramento, CA. 1993.
- Oroville Wildlife Management Area Management Plan. California Department of Fish and Game (DFG). Sacramento, CA. 1978.
- Lake Oroville Recreation Area Development Plan. DPR. 1973.
- Butte County Bicycle Plan, Butte County 2001 Regional Transportation Plan. Butte County Association of Governments. Chico, CA. 2001.

Task 2—Determination of Consistency

This study will evaluate whether or not existing project facilities and operations are consistent with the comprehensive plans reviewed during Task 1. Potential changes to project facilities and operations that are being suggested by work groups will also be evaluated for consistency. If inconsistencies are identified, a discussion regarding what would be necessary to resolve the inconsistencies (if anything) will be included as part of this task.

6.0 Results and Products/Deliverables

Results

As a result of this study, it will be possible to determine if project features and operations are consistent with comprehensive/management plans. Equally important will be the ability to evaluate whether the ideas and/or proposals developed by work groups will be consistent with comprehensive plans, and what aspects of proposed actions need to be altered to attain consistency.

Products/Deliverables

The following products will be developed for this study:

- Interim Comprehensive Plan Consistency Report
- Comprehensive Plan Consistency Report

These reports will assess how compliant the project currently is with comprehensive and/or management plans and how compliant planned or suggested future actions would be.

7.0 Coordination and Implementation Strategy

Coordination with Other Resource Areas/Studies

Prior to commencing this study, the research team will meet with other work groups to determine where and when relevant data can be gathered and shared with other groups.

This study will likely be coordinated with the Engineering and Operations; Environmental; Cultural Resources; and Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Groups. Much of the data collection for this study will be conducted concurrently with other work groups, and in conjunction with Study #1—Land Use and Study #2—Land Management.

Issues, Concerns, Comments Tracking and/or Compliance Requirements

No Issue Statements or Issues that address consistency with comprehensive and/or management plans have been developed by the Land Use Work Group.

8.0 Study Schedule

Data collection: March through October 2002.

Data analysis and report writing: October through December 2002.

Interim Comprehensive Plan Consistency Report due: January 2003.

Final Comprehensive Plan Consistency Report due: April 2003.